United Nations
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
FORTY-EIGHTH SESSION

Official Records

56th PLENARY MEETING
Tuesday, 16 November 1993 at 10 a.m.

NEW YORK

President: Mr. INSANALLY (Guyana)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 46

QUESTION OF THE FALKLAND ISLANDS (MALVINAS)

The PRESIDENT: With regard to this item I wish to call the attention of the General Assembly to document A/48/266, which contains a Joint Statement issued in Buenos Aires and London on 12 July 1993 by the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Similarly, taking into account General Assembly decision 47/408 of 10 November 1992, I wish to inform representatives that, following consultations on item 46, "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)", it is proposed that the Assembly decide to postpone consideration of this item and to include it in the provisional agenda of its forty-ninth session.

May I take it therefore that the General Assembly, taking into account decision 47/408, wishes to take note of document A/48/266, to which I have referred, and that it is also the wish of the General Assembly to postpone consideration of the item and to include it in the provisional agenda of the forty-ninth session?

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT: The General Assembly has thus concluded its consideration of agenda item 46.

AGENDA ITEM 26

COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE CONFERENCE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

(a) REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (A/48/549)

(b) DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/48/L.18)

The PRESIDENT: I call on the representative of Sweden to introduce draft resolution A/48/L.18.

Mr. OSVALD (Sweden): I have the honour to speak both in my capacity as Permanent Representative of Sweden and as representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

It is my pleasure to introduce draft resolution A/48/L.18 on Cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. Before I continue my statement I wish to make two announcements.

First, to the list of sponsors in the printed version of the draft resolution, the following names should be added: Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Liechtenstein, Malta, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, the Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine and the United States of America.

I also wish to announce that in the English version of the draft resolution, in the third preambular paragraph, there is a typing error. Reference is made to Chapter VII

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

93-87189 (E)

Distr. GENERAL

A/48/PV.56
26 November 1993

ENGLISH

of the Charter. That should be Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations.

This draft resolution is one reflection of the need jointly to develop the elements of what has been called interlocking institutions of European security. The challenges ahead, the new possibilities given and the complex problems we are facing in the CSCE region require us to adjust old structures and interrelationships and complement them with new initiatives.

When Sweden assumed responsibility as Chairman of the CSCE one year ago the central task was to develop the CSCE as an instrument in the quest for peace. We therefore wanted to consolidate the community of values, we wanted to put emphasis on preventive diplomacy and crisis management, and we wanted to improve cooperation with other international organizations and continue to strengthen CSCE structures.

The role of the CSCE as an instrument for conflict prevention and resolution makes increased cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE not only desirable but necessary. Pragmatic and effective work in the field is necessary in order to prevent conflicts from arising or at least from turning into armed ones and to contribute to the resolution of ongoing conflicts.

It is in this spirit that Sweden during its tenure as Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE has sought to assist in finding new ways for this concrete cooperation. The framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations Secretariat and the CSCE that was signed in May this year by the Secretary-General and the Chairman of the CSCE Council, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Sweden, is therefore an important expression of the continuing development of our relations.

The recent decision by the Assembly to grant observer status to the CSCE will also enable us to develop closer ties between the two organizations to the benefit of the development of cooperation in the long run and facilitating our daily work. This arrangement also means that the Secretary-General of the CSCE, Mr. Wilhelm Höynck, will today address this Assembly for the first time.

Political support from the United Nations, not least from the Security Council, to CSCE activities is an essential contribution to United Nations-CSCE cooperation and in particular to concrete conflict resolution activities. The CSCE is consequently developing the means to provide relevant information and support to the United Nations and its decision-making bodies through appropriate channels. Interaction between the CSCE and the Security Council enhances a common strategy for common purposes.

In accordance with the framework on cooperation and coordination the two sides now hold consultations on a regular basis and uphold the frequent exchange of information on relevant issues. Furthermore, close contact is maintained with developments in each specific undertaking in order to ensure coordination and complementarity and to avoid duplication. Consultation on joint missions and examination of the possibility of joint reports are other important parts of the cooperation under way.

The need for mutual assistance in the field is an important element of the framework. Cooperation on the ground is of course essential and much time and effort have been invested in order to find ways to implement this provision in various conflict areas.

Cooperation and coordination have just started. More could and should be done. In the field, as well as between headquarters, political will should be transformed into cooperative action.

When discussing cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE, it is important to bear in mind that the two organizations have different competences and different comparative advantages. Mutual support and coordination should therefore, in our mind, be the guiding principles for such cooperation.

In practice, this cooperation and coordination can take and are taking different forms: in one conflict the two organizations might each tackle separate but coordinated tasks, while in another, one of them might take the lead, relying on political back-up from the other.

This concept, aimed at a common strategy, flexibility and the avoidance of duplication of work, is well described in numerous resolutions and statements issued by this Assembly, by the Security Council, and by the Secretary-General in his report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277).

I would especially like to draw attention to the statement made by the Security Council on 28 January 1993 inviting regional arrangements to study ways and means of further improving the coordination of their efforts with those of the United Nations. The Council stressed that this interaction should be flexible and adequate to each specific situation.

Allow me to give a few examples of the way in which this flexibility is carried out by the CSCE and the United Nations in the CSCE region.

Let me first mention the importance the CSCE attaches to the implementation of the United Nations

sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). The coordinating role played by the CSCE, together with the European Community, in monitoring the sanctions should be regarded as an active and effective contribution to the world community's efforts to come to grips with the tragic situation in the former Yugoslavia.

The CSCE is also preparing to take an active part in a comprehensive restructuring and rehabilitation programme in former Yugoslavia, to be implemented as soon as a peace agreement is reached.

In The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the long-term spillover mission of the CSCE and the UNPROFOR/Macedonia command are cooperating closely to achieve their common goal of preventing the conflict in former Yugoslavia from spreading to that Republic.

In Georgia, the efforts of the United Nations and the CSCE are increasingly coordinated, on the ground as well as in the ongoing endeavours to find a peaceful settlement of the conflicts. The invitation to the CSCE to participate in the future peace talks on Abkhazia organized by the United Nations, and vice versa on South Ossetia, are important steps. Mutual liaison in observer missions is a possibility to be considered.

In Tajikistan, the United Nations and the CSCE can in joint action play mutually supporting roles in trying to help that country emerge from its present plight.

The efforts to find a peaceful solution to the conflict in and around Nagorny Karabakh within the CSCE Minsk process is being strengthened by political support from the Security Council, manifested once again last week with the adoption of resolution 884 (1993).

A trilateral discussion on cooperation between the United Nations, the CSCE and the Council of Europe regarding human rights and the human dimension was initiated by the CSCE this summer with the aim of promoting human rights and democratic values.

It is a great challenge, for both the United Nations and the CSCE, to try to develop new forms of cooperation and coordination in this volatile period in the CSCE region. The General Assembly can make a contribution to this work here today by unanimously adopting draft resolution A/48/L.18.

Mr. SHUSTOV (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): First of all, I would like say that we share the hope of the representative of Sweden that draft resolution A/48/L.18, which we are discussing, will be adopted unanimously. On behalf of my own delegation, I hope we will act in this fashion because what is being discussed here today will be discussed in Vienna on Thursday at the Vienna Forum of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

The Russian Federation believes in the development of close and multifaceted cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. We view the CSCE as the leading pan-European organization, one which plays a priority role with respect to other European associations. We are convinced that the CSCE is an institution that plays a unique role in the strengthening of security and stability on the European continent and in the Asian countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), and in the prevention and settlement of ethnic and other conflicts. The Russian Federation believes in the active development of collective mechanisms to be used by the CSCE for the prevention and settlement of crises and for a substantial increase in its peace-keeping potential; we feel that this young international organization should be able to make more active use of the experience, both positive and negative, accumulated by the United Nations in conducting peace-keeping operations.

The Russian Federation believes that mutual support and interaction in promoting peace and stability should become the central element of cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. At the same time, it seems quite important that the role and potential of the United Nations Security Council will increase as a result of the development of active cooperation with the growing potential of the CSCE.

It is also our belief that the CSCE, as a regional agreement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, is the major partner of the United Nations in the area of peace-keeping in the European and Atlantic region. That is why we will, together with other member States of the CSCE, continue in our efforts to strengthen the legal and organizational basis of the CSCE as a regional association. We hope the time will come when the CSCE will change its name from the "Conference" to the "Organization" on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

In this area, we have already taken some important steps, and on behalf of my delegation I would like to follow the representative of Sweden in welcoming here to this meeting of the General Assembly the Secretary-General of the CSCE, Ambassador Wilhelm Höynck.

The experience of peacemaking activities in former Yugoslavia, Nagorny Karabakh, Abkhazia, South Ossetia, Transnistria and other conflict areas has shown that the efficiency of the efforts of members of the international

community depends largely on the measure of coordination and the sharing of responsibility between different international and regional structures.

In this process, it is important to act gradually and realistically. A simplistic and one-sided approach is out of place. Experience has shown that the combination of efforts by regional organizations with United Nations activities must be flexible and must correspond to specific situations.

For that reason, without diminishing the importance of other issues, it is important to pay particular attention to a rational distribution of functions between the United Nations and the CSCE in their anti-crisis actions.

The Russian delegation believes that the CSCE could assume more solid political responsibility for peace-keeping activities within its geographic zone. We would welcome the eventual broader competence and structural reinforcement of the CSCE in decision-making and planning, and in conducting peace-keeping operations and exercising control over them. At the same time, the present concept of CSCE peace-keeping activities continues to impose certain limitations that exclude the elements of peace enforcement. However, at this stage it may actually be an advantage in terms of a division of labour between the two organizations.

It would be appropriate to focus the interaction between the United Nations and the CSCE in the area of peace-keeping on establishing a dialogue on doctrinal aspects and the exchange of information, and on conducting joint actions, including the establishment of joint United Nations-CSCE missions - for example, observation or fact-finding missions. In addition, it would be appropriate to provide both for the possibility of including individual representatives of one of the organizations in the missions of the other and for the establishment of full-fledged joint missions with a single mandate and under common leadership. At the same time, the Security Council in its resolutions could confirm and support the decisions of the CSCE and also give instructions to the CSCE, which is a regional organization.

The issue of cooperation between the CSCE and the United Nations in mutually ensuring the security of mission personnel is becoming ever more topical. This idea could be implemented in practice at this stage through, for example, the conclusion of an agreement between the United Nations forces stationed in the territory of The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the CSCE mission deployed there on the inclusion of CSCE representatives in United Nations evacuation plans in case of emergencies.

In our view, it would be advisable for the CSCE in coming years to consolidate its orientation towards early warning and the use of preventive political and diplomatic means of influence, without trying, for the time being, to create within its framework the material base for peace-keeping operations. The task of the CSCE should consist first of all in detecting, localizing and seeking to avert crises, establishing a dialogue between parties in conflict, and ensuring observance of cease-fires.

The CSCE could consider the specific issue of assuming certain responsibilities in post-crisis settlement in the former Yugoslavia, thus supplementing the efforts of the European Community and releasing the United Nations from its long-standing involvement in the rehabilitation of this region. I must say that a very interesting proposal in this regard was submitted to the CSCE by the delegation of Sweden. Incidentally, this could be a gesture towards those countries that have shown concern about the particular attention apparently paid by the United Nations to the Yugoslav crisis.

We are just beginning to comprehend the issue of the rational distribution of responsibilities between the United Nations and the CSCE in the settlement of crises and conflicts throughout the territory of the Commonwealth of Independent States. It may be precisely in this area that we should test by practical experience the idea of joint United Nations-CSCE missions. To start, we could try to apply this idea in Tajikistan. Such a mission could, in particular, promote dialogue between the Government and the opposition, contribute to the solution of the refugee problem and launch the development of guarantees of the rights of all ethnic groups.

In the context of possible interaction between the United Nations and the CSCE in the area of early warning, ideas have been put forth concerning the establishment, under the auspices of the CSCE, of its own peace-keeping forces along the lines of the future stand-by forces of the United Nations. In our opinion, we could discuss at this stage a formula for joint use of the future stand-by forces on the understanding that the United Nations could promote the use for CSCE purposes of contingents that were idle at any given moment. At any rate, all these ideas deserve to be discussed by the United Nations and the CSCE.

Peace-keeping, which I have discussed in some detail, is the central but not the only sphere of cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. There is a perceived need to develop closer links between the CSCE Warsaw Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and the United Nations Centre for Human Rights, in particular to ensure a more rapid exchange of

information between them. Such cooperation will undoubtedly stimulate the activities of both organizations in the establishment of democratic values and human rights.

We feel that the strengthening of interaction between the CSCE Economic Forum and the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe - with a view to providing assistance to CSCE member States in carrying out their economic reforms - also has good prospects.

The establishment of a regular exchange of opinions and information between the United Nations Secretary-General and the Chairman-in-Office of the Council of the CSCE, as well as the CSCE Secretary-General as the representative of the Chairman-in-Office, has acquired a great importance. In this connection, we attach particular importance to the document entitled "Framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations Secretariat and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe". We hope that the provisions contained in this document will be further developed.

We are certain that the adoption by the General Assembly at its forty-eighth session of the draft resolution entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe" and co-sponsored by the Russian Federation, will, as the Ambassador of Sweden has said, lend new impetus to the strengthening of interaction between these two organizations.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that the discussion of this problem in the General Assembly is of great practical importance, since it is taking place on the eve of the meeting in Rome of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the 53 CSCE member States, which will serve as an important landmark in the development of the CSCE as an effective international organization. On behalf of our delegation, I should like to ask the Secretary-General, Mr. Höynk, to report to the Vienna Forum of the CSCE on the discussion of the draft resolution at the forty-eighth session of the General Assembly.

Mr. BOTEZ (Romania) *(interpretation from French)*: The formal coordination of the activities of the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) is a new subject that undoubtedly deserves to be inscribed on the evolving agenda of the General Assembly.

However, I feel that in fact such coordination did not begin with the adoption by the General Assembly at its last session of resolution 47/10, which opens the chapter of institutional contacts and joint action. Rather, it seems to me that this resolution gives formal expression to a structure that has been coming into closer harmony since the mid-1970s, when first the spirit and then the process which we have come to call the "Helsinki" spirit and process were established in the geographical space that generated the two major conflagrations of this century. I believe that the world today cannot be understood in isolation from the history of the harmonization between the United Nations and the CSCE.

Indeed, the international situation following the end of the cold war gives us a different view of the past. To cite Borges, every great writer discovers or even invents a line of predecessors that justifies him. In today's world we understand even better than we did in 1975 the importance of the United Nations and the Helsinki process for the Europe today and for mankind as a whole. From among the ills of recent decades, it is their spirit that should be kept as the precursor of the realities of 1993. But this new reading of history also suggests a sort of distribution of roles which was not noticed in the past but which can, I believe, be sustained from our present viewpoint.

I would say, at the risk of didactic oversimplification, that, at least for us in Europe, the United Nations and the Helsinki Conference play complementary roles. In the United Nations the main issue was safeguarding peace, in an attempt to reduce as much as possible the risk of confrontation between States or groups of States. We could thus speak of a scope embracing external, international structures of peace and security. In our view at least, the Helsinki spirit also related to internal or intra-national structures of peace and security. There is no need to repeat that respect for human rights in prosperous and stable democracies diminishes the risk of confrontation.

Allow me, as a representative of a country that slumbered under dictatorship for almost half a century, to mention here, for example, the immense role played by the famous "third basket" concerning human rights for the protection of anti-totalitarian dissent and for the development of civilian society in Central and Eastern Europe, phenomena in the absence of which the anti-communist revolutions of 1989 cannot be explained. "Solidarnose" in Poland, Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia and the Free Trade Union in Romania, to give but a few examples, are all expressions of the Helsinki spirit, and the new Europe remains extremely grateful to those who embarked on and followed up this process.

The collapse of communism in Central and Eastern Europe opened up a new chapter in the history of the United Nations, in the evolution of the spirit and process of Helsinki, and also in their possible relationships. The

United Nations, hindered for decades by the cold war, can finally begin to shoulder its planetary responsibilities.

The Helsinki process has also gathered new momentum. Differences between external and internal structures of peace seem to be disappearing in a Europe where dictatorship has disappeared and where, theoretically, at least, pluralistic democracy and market economies have triumphed. Even more clearly than before, the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) must be seen as different political expressions of the same spirit, marked by understanding, diversity and cooperation. At the Helsinki Summit in July 1992, participating States declared that the CSCE was a regional arrangement in the sense of the United Nations Charter and that as such it provided an important link between European and global security. The cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE and with any other regional structure is on two essential levels: first, a conceptual and theoretical level where an attempt is made to define the fundamental political meaning of such cooperation and, secondly, a level of means and practical action, from a pragmatic and operational perspective.

Theoretically, the scope of the possibilities for cooperation is remarkable. Suffice it to mention here the potential of regional organizations in the discharge of functions such as preventive diplomacy, the maintenance of peace, the restoration of peace and the consolidation of stability and peace after conflicts, as pointed out in the excellent report "An Agenda for Peace" of His Excellency the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali. But this theoretical scope of cooperation must be explored and utilized. Our task here is that of creating the institutional framework for such action.

From the standpoint of means and practical actions, the Secretary-General's report (A/48/549) of 2 November 1993 on cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE paints a stimulating and promising picture. Suffice it to mention by way of example the determination and promptness with which the CSCE, upon the request of the Republic of Moldova and in coordination with the United Nations, got involved in the settlement of the grave situation facing the Government of the Republic of Moldova in the eastern part of the country, where the troops of a foreign army are still to be found.

As we can all see, cooperation and interaction between the United Nations and the CSCE is under way. In resolution 48/5 the CSCE was granted observer status in the United Nations General Assembly. The exchange of letters, in May 1993, between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman-in-Office of the Council of the CSCE was also a significant step in this cooperation. It is a duty, not merely an honour and a pleasure, to pay a special tribute here to the Secretary-General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, and Mrs. Margaretha af Ugglas, Foreign Minister of Sweden and current Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, for their personal contribution to this process.

In the present era, saturated with holistic, systemic and globalistic approaches, there is no longer any need to repeat that the whole is not merely the mechanical sum of its parts and that the part is not reducible to a mere fragment of the whole. The world as a whole, which is the scope of the United Nations, and Europe, or the Euro-Atlantic space, on which the CSCE focuses, cannot, hence, be seen from the standpoint of simple inclusion, as a mathematician might say. There exists a globalist spirit and a European or Euro-Atlantic spirit. There is a new awareness, evolved over recent decades, that makes it possible to understand that peoples, countries and regions can be and remain different without any loss of pride or standing. This prospect of tolerant globalization and constructive regionalization must, I believe, dominate relations between the United Nations and the CSCE. With this approach their cooperation becomes a project to be defined rather than a decision to be taken.

It is often said that for a problem to be solved it must first be correctly formulated. But it is a commonplace that, particularly in the world of politics, the formulation of problems is the domain of dialogue. Draft resolution A/48/L.18, prepared with remarkable diligence by the Swedish delegation, assures us that such a dialogue will continue next year. As a sponsor of this draft resolution, we express the hope that it will be adopted by consensus.

Mr. SUCHARIPA (Austria): Austria fully concurs with the Secretary-General's view, expressed in "An Agenda for Peace", that

> "regional arrangements ... in many cases possess a potential that should be utilized". *(A/47/277, para. 64)*

Over the last year we have witnessed a considerable increase in cooperation between the United Nations and regional arrangements such as the Organization of African Unity (OAU), the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). This positive trend finally brought about an implementation of the principle of complementarity, which is, of course, an underlying idea of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter.

The participating States of the CSCE reaffirmed in the Final Act signed at Helsinki in 1975 their

> "full and active support for the United Nations and for the enhancement of its role and effectiveness in strengthening international peace, security and justice". *(CSCE, Final Act, 1975, "Declaration on principles guiding relations between participating States", third preambular paragraph)*

They also explicitly declared at the Helsinki Summit in 1992 that the CSCE is a regional arrangement in the spirit of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, and, as such, that it provides an important link between European and global security.

Consequently, last year, in resolution 47/10, the General Assembly had already stressed the need for enhanced cooperation and coordination between the CSCE and the United Nations. A month ago, it granted observer status to the CSCE with the adoption of resolution 48/5. We therefore have the pleasure today to welcome Ambassador Höynck, Secretary-General of the CSCE, as observer.

Free of regulatory restrictions, the CSCE has been able in a relatively short period of time to elaborate a comprehensive set of political instruments for conflict prevention and conflict resolution. Those already applied in practice have proven to be extremely successful, as CSCE missions in crisis areas have shown. They operate on the basis of flexible mandates covering political, military and human rights issues.

Let me just mention some examples and how they relate to various United Nations efforts: the CSCE has deployed missions of long duration in Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina, in areas of conflict or potential conflict in former Yugoslavia, where the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) is not deployed. The very presence and activities of these missions had a positive effect on developments there; Austria was glad to have been able to participate in those missions. The Belgrade authorities, however, refused to extend the protocol agreement authorizing the deployment of the missions, thereby, *de facto*, ending their activities. In response to that act, the Security Council adopted its resolution 855 (1993), requesting the Belgrade authorities to reconsider their position and to cooperate with the CSCE. Unfortunately, this has not been done to date.

Furthermore, the CSCE has assisted the neighbouring States of Serbia and Montenegro in monitoring the observance of sanctions imposed by the Security Council. In this regard, cooperation with the relevant unit of the United Nations Secretariat is vital.

The Security Council has on a number of occasions supported the efforts of the CSCE, and in particular the Minsk Group, to achieve a peaceful settlement of the conflict in and around the Nagorny Karabakh region of the Azerbaijani Republic. In this case as in some others, the CSCE is taking the lead role according to an agreed distribution of tasks between itself and the United Nations.

Cooperation on the ground between missions of both the United Nations and the CSCE has begun in Georgia and Tajikistan. We are aware of the complex situations there and hope that the practical contacts between the United Nations and the CSCE missions will soon be strengthened and will lead to full cooperation.

These concrete examples clearly show the increasing importance of enhancing cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE. Austria therefore welcomes the exchange of letters of 26 May 1993 between the Secretary-General and the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE Council, which provides a framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE. In those letters the two sides agreed to maintain close contact to ensure coordination, complementarity and mutual support, and to avoid possible duplication in the planning and carrying out of activities. In order to achieve these aims, consultations and contacts on a daily basis are necessary. Let me take this opportunity to pay a tribute to Ambassador Peter Osvald, Permanent Representative of the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, Sweden, whose Mission has pursued the implementation of the framework in an exemplary manner.

However, increasing the practical implementation of cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE will not be possible without having a United Nations liaison mechanism to the CSCE at the site of most of its bodies, Vienna. The framework set out in the exchange of letters explicitly mentions three points of contact in Vienna: the delegation of the State holding the office of Chairman, the CSCE Secretary-General and other CSCE institutions in Vienna, such as the Conflict Prevention Centre. The current developments, in particular the rapidly increasing activities of the CSCE and the henceforth permanent meetings of the relevant CSCE bodies, first and foremost the Committee of Senior Officials - the Vienna Group - clearly necessitate creating such a liaison mechanism between the United Nations and the CSCE in Vienna. Given the presence of various units and services of the United Nations Secretariat in Vienna, such a step should not provide any administrative problems.

While we welcome the growing cooperation, we see room for improvement and a vast potential for intensification to the benefit of all interested parties.

Austria firmly believes that cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE in the interest of peace and security should be further enhanced and developed.

The PRESIDENT: I should like to propose that the list of speakers in the debate on this item be closed now. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Assembly agrees to that proposal.

It was so decided.

Mr. HUSLID (Norway): Norway welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). The need for enhanced cooperation and coordination has been stressed ever since the CSCE summit meeting took place in Helsinki 16 months ago.

The exchange of letters of 26 May between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE on the arrangements for cooperation and coordination established a framework for common approaches. The decision of 13 October to grant the CSCE observer status in the General Assembly strengthens further the basis for increasingly close cooperation and coordination.

The decisions of the Helsinki meeting defined an important CSCE role in early warning, conflict prevention and crisis management. That role has been filled, through concrete actions in conflict areas as well as areas of tension involving national minority issues that have the potential to develop into a conflict. Seven CSCE missions have been dispatched to areas of the former Yugoslavia and the former Soviet Union, and a peace-keeping operation has been prepared for Nagorny Karabakh.

The High Commissioner on National Minorities plays an important role in early warning. We consider that his activities have been very useful and important. However, there is scope for increasing the effectiveness of the CSCE's own activities. The CSCE has also an indisputable potential for assisting the United Nations in carrying out United Nations decisions on several important issues ranging from human rights to conflict prevention.

It is stated in the CSCE Helsinki decisions that the CSCE is a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter and as such provides an important link between European and global security. It is worth emphasizing that cooperative security can only be built on complementarity and improved interaction among all the relevant international organizations. Progress has been made towards this end, but more should and can be done. Rivalry must be avoided here, and a pragmatic approach is necessary. There are really enough tasks for everybody.

The new tasks before the CSCE require enhanced practical coordination and cooperation with the United Nations. This is particularly important in conflict areas where both the CSCE and the United Nations have a presence, as in Georgia, Nagorny Karabakh and Tajikistan. The activities in those areas should be coordinated in order to be mutually reinforcing, and it is important to avoid duplication in planning activities.

While the United Nations has a responsibility for global security, the CSCE has a particular responsibility for the security and stability of Europe. We therefore find it useful that the CSCE and the United Nations consult prior to any decision on establishing new missions in the CSCE area. The aim of such consultation should be to obtain a division of labour that would benefit all parties. The first question to be raised is which of the two organizations is best suited to establish a mission.

Norway would like to emphasize that this should be a continuous process. Formal arrangements for mutual exchange of information should be supplemented by informal contacts as part of the normal working routines of the CSCE and the United Nations personnel involved in matters of common concern. At the same time, the dialogue between the Secretary-General and the Chairman-in-Office should continue on a regular basis. We are convinced that this would result in increased efficiency and a wider capacity for addressing new challenges. Frequent contacts at all levels would facilitate a pragmatic division of labour in each case.

I conclude by stating that Norway supports the draft resolution on cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE.

Mr. BROUHNS (Belgium) *(interpretation from French)*: I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union on the question of cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). I should like to welcome the presence among us of the CSCE Secretary-General, Ambassador Wilhelm Höynck.

At the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly we welcomed the inclusion of this new item on its agenda. Today we reiterate our support for the consideration of this item, which has recently taken on even greater importance.

The CSCE, which emerged from the cold war, must today take up new challenges, including the resurgence of nationalism, ethnic conflicts, intolerance and xenophobia. The CSCE's approach to those challenges is based on a comprehensive concept of security, that concept establishes a relationship between the maintenance of peace and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It creates a link between cooperation in the fields of the economy and the environment, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, peaceful relations between States. This comprehensive concept is the basis of the CSCE's preventive diplomacy.

Moreover, the CSCE has now acquired new instruments. The powers of the Council and of the Committee of Senior Officials have been strengthened, enabling them, for example, to dispatch missions to crisis regions. The establishment of the office of CSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities has helped to strengthen the CSCE's capacity to avert tension and potential conflict. Lastly, the CSCE now has peace-keeping tools, such as the deployment of observation and monitoring missions in conflict zones. In that connection, we welcome the forthcoming meeting of the CSCE ministerial Council, to be held on 30 November and 1 December in Rome, where the mechanisms and structures of the CSCE are to be further strengthened.

At the end of the Helsinki Summit last July, the Heads of State and Government of the CSCE declared their understanding that the CSCE was a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations. That declaration opened the way towards greater cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE, which the Secretary-General of the United Nations welcomed in his report, "An Agenda for Peace."

In the past few months cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE has been demonstrated in various crises. In support of United Nations efforts in the former Yugoslavia the CSCE has deployed long-term missions in Kosovo, Sandjak, Vojvodina and The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. It has also assisted in investigations of human rights violations, *inter alia*, by sending in 1992 a mission to investigate human rights violations and to examine living conditions in detention camps. It has also assisted neighbouring States to monitor compliance with Security Council sanctions.

In other crises the CSCE, with United Nations support, has become the principal mediator, particularly concerning the conflict in Nagorny Karabakh, with regard to which the Security Council has several times called upon the parties to resume negotiations within the context of the Minsk Group peace process.

While cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE in conflict prevention and resolution has been strengthened, we should also emphasize cooperation with the Commission on Human Rights in the human-rights field; with the Economic Commission for Europe with regard to the economy and the environment; and with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees with regard to refugees and minorities.

•

Exchange of information between the CSCE and the United Nations is already well established. The Secretary-General is represented at meetings of the Committee of Senior Officials and will be sending a representative to the Rome Council meeting. There is also a regular exchange of information between the Mission of the CSCE Chairman-in-Office in New York and the United Nations Secretariat. In this connection, we welcome the efforts of the Swedish Chairman-in-Office, and we trust that contacts will become even stronger in future.

Mrs. Fritsche (Liechtenstein), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The examples I have given only illustrate the growing cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. This cooperation should be strengthened in future. To that end, Mrs. Af Ugglas, the Swedish Foreign Minister and Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, had an exchange of letters with the Secretary-General of the United Nations last May with a view to establishing a framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE. On 30 October last the General Assembly adopted a resolution inviting the CSCE to participate in its work as an Observer.

In view of the complexity and diversity of the questions that confront and will in future confront the United Nations and the CSCE, cooperation and coordination between them will have based more on pragmatism than on a rigid framework of principles, which could very quickly prove to be inadequate. The goal of maintaining peace in the CSCE region cannot but benefit from greater cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE, which can in turn gain from a flexible synergy of each organization's experience, competence, and means of action. We trust there will be more active cooperation and coordination on the ground. Where the situation justifies it, this could involve appointing someone to represent both the United Nations and the CSCE.

Fully aware of the contribution that can be made to global stability, the European Union encourages this cooperation and welcomes the debate now taking place in the General Assembly on this item.

Mr. BREITENSTEIN (Finland): Last year Finland co-sponsored the draft resolution which initiated the cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). This year the General Assembly has taken a step further as it has unanimously invited the CSCE to participate in the Assembly's sessions and work as an Observer.

We welcome this development. The capacity of the United Nations for action in conflict prevention and in crisis management has for some time been stretched to the limit. It is therefore both necessary and natural that the potential of other institutions should be used whenever possible. Recognizing this, the leaders of the States participating in the CSCE decided at the Helsinki Summit in 1992 that the CSCE should be considered a regional arrangement in the meaning of Chapter VIII of the Charter. This decision is fully in conformity with the concept of mutually supportive roles for the United Nations and regional organizations as set out in the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace" (A/47/277). The CSCE is indeed a natural partner for cooperation with the United Nations.

During the past year cooperation and coordination of activities between the United Nations and the CSCE have been initiated in several conflict areas. Useful experience has already been gained for instance in Abkhazia and South Ossetia, where the United Nations and the CSCE both have missions. A de facto division of labour has emerged between the United Nations and the CSCE in other conflict areas as well. The United Nations has the lead in Tajikistan, where CSCE involvement is under consideration. The CSCE plays a leading role in the attempts to settle the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan over Nagorny Karabakh. It is also involved in Moldova.

Furthermore, in the Framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE it was agreed that the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE should hold consultations on a regular basis on activities of common interest. It is understandable that it will take some time for the practical forms of this cooperation to evolve and develop. The missions in Georgia show us how important it is to achieve good and effective cooperation. Conflicts of interest and duplication of work should, and can, be avoided through a good working relationship between the missions. Where difficulties occur, they can certainly be overcome through mutual efforts and good will. It is also imperative that the respective missions present a harmonious and united image to the local population; otherwise we risk losing credibility. This should not be difficult, as the work of the United Nations and that of the CSCE reinforce each other and have the same goals.

The challenges which local and regional conflicts in the CSCE area pose are, unfortunately, enormous. These challenges must be met. In this, coordinated efforts by the United Nations, the CSCE and other European and transatlantic institutions are needed.

The Government of Finland wholeheartedly supports the further development of cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE. The present Framework agreement provides a good basis for this. Additional efforts by both institutions are, however, needed if we want to be able to respond to the growing challenges.

Mr. FULCI (Italy): Two weeks from today, during the ministerial Council in Rome, Italy will assume the chairmanship of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). That is why I am speaking after our Belgian colleague, who made a statement on behalf of the European Union with which we of course entirely agree.

In the year of its chairmanship of the CSCE, Italy intends fully to play the political role which is assigned to the Chairman by CSCE documents and which includes representing the CSCE in other countries and organizations. In this context, we will work for closer and more regular ties between the CSCE and other international organizations, particularly the United Nations. All 53 States members of the CSCE recognize the need for stronger ties with the United Nations, whose increasing role in the management of international crises has led it into areas where the CSCE too has been forced to step up its engagement.

So far, the CSCE's efforts to achieve cooperation with the United Nations have followed two basic guidelines: first, achieving agreements on the mechanism for collaboration between the United Nations and the CSCE; and, secondly, obtaining observer status for the CSCE in the United Nations in order that it may participate in the proceedings of the General Assembly. New points of contact have been established in New York, Geneva and Vienna through the missions of the rotating chairmanship of the CSCE.

This course of action has produced the outcome that we hoped for, thanks in particular to the energetic work of the Swedish delegation to the United Nations under the leadership of our colleague Peter Osvald, to whom I wish to extend my warmest appreciation.

Thus began a deeper understanding of the respective activities of the United Nations and the CSCE, and a more concrete relationship. The first results of these efforts can be seen in the understanding reached between the United Nations and the CSCE on The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, as well as in the decision last April 28 by the Committee of Senior Officials to begin negotiating an agreement on mutual cooperation in Georgia.

As the next Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, Italy aims to further explore all the possibilities, not only for cooperation between our two organizations but for a true coordination of their respective activities.

It is our intention, first of all, to implement all the measures provided by the framework which has been set up between the United Nations and the CSCE. Duplication of activities and gaps should be prevented as much as possible. The same applies to utilization of resources, which, as we know only too well, are always limited. On a purely pragmatic basis, the two organizations could even alternate leading and supporting roles in certain peace initiatives. Above all, we must take advantage of the potential synergy between the two organizations. We intend to promote and further develop this cooperation in a way appropriate to varying circumstances, in the framework of preventive diplomacy, which in our view is and must remain the CSCE's primary vocation.

It is our opinion that a greater, more harmonious political and organizational relationship between the United Nations and the CSCE could become a fundamental asset in defining a response to tensions and conflicts in the CSCE area. Concrete cooperation between the two organizations has already begun. Let me also cite a few cases, some of which have already been mentioned by previous speakers: in the former Yugoslavia, through the long-term missions to Kosovo, Sandjak, and Vojvodina mandated by Security Council resolution 855 (1993); through the Corell Mission to assess the human-rights situation in Croatia and Bosnia, which contributed to the establishment of the International Tribunal in resolution 808 (1993); through Sanction Advisory Missions, which guarantee application of the measures imposed by Security Council resolutions 757 (1992) and 820 (1993); in Nagorny Karabakh, where the work of the CSCE's Minsk Group has met the full encouragement and support of the Security Council; and in Georgia and Tajikistan, where the situation on the ground suggests that the CSCE and the United Nations can and should join forces.

We believe that these opportunities should be further studied, clarified and developed. The fact that the CSCE is a regional organization, as provided for by Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, carries both definite privileges and inescapable burdens. Italy is well aware of this and will do everything possible to consolidate this cooperation. We are fully confident that our United Nations interlocutors in New York, Geneva and Vienna, and in the specific contexts of regional crises in the CSCE area, will share this approach.

Mr. BATIOUK (Ukraine): Ukraine willingly supports the welcome trend towards closer cooperation and interaction between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) in all fields of mutual interest - first and foremost in those relating to conflict prevention and conflict resolution, as well as to protection and promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Proceeding from this stand, Ukraine, as a participant of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, supported the statement of the participating States of the 1992 CSCE Helsinki Summit, which declared that the CSCE is a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter.

While considering the security of Ukraine inseparable from that of all its neighbours, Ukraine stands for the establishment of a reliable all-European system of collective security wherein the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe plays a crucial role. In this regard, we welcome the agreement reached between the United Nations Secretary-General and the CSCE Council's Chairman-in-Office on the framework of cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE. In our view, the interaction envisaged by this agreement should enhance the efficiency of peacemaking efforts by the international community in the conflict areas of the CSCE region and, at the same time, avoid unnecessary and costly overlapping or duplication in these activities. A closer cooperation between the two organizations will also promote the regular exchange of information between the United Nations and the CSCE, especially in the fields of early warning and prevention of conflicts, as well as at the stage of their resolution.

All peace-keeping and peacemaking activities should be of a truly international character and must be carried out in strict accordance with the United Nations Charter and the fundamental CSCE documents. We oppose yielding to any State's claims for providing it with special powers from the United Nations or the CSCE in the field of maintaining or restoring peace in any region or subregion of the world or of Europe. In accordance with the United Nations Charter and the CSCE documents, the mandate for peace-keeping operations must be endorsed case by case and only at the official request of the Government of the State whose territory becomes the scene of those operations. Ukraine believes it advisable to refrain from involving in peace-keeping operations countries which are

known to be able to use their participation in peace-keeping activities for consolidating or imposing their political, economic or military interests in the region.

Current realities make it necessary to maintain close contact between the United Nations and the CSCE in carrying out various missions, ensuring their interaction and the exchange of results derived from their activities. We envisage and invite the possibility of joint missions, if need be. In our opinion, the joint participation of representatives and experts in relevant conferences and forums held within the framework of the United Nations and the CSCE is essential.

We believe that the present arrangement on cooperation and interaction between the United Nations and the CSCE in the field of preventing and resolving conflicts is but the first step towards solving today's most pressing and urgent problems. That first step must be followed by additional ones which would expand this cooperation to new and important fields. In particular, it is worth examining the possibility of establishing closer ties between the United Nations and the CSCE in all spheres of human activity.

The consequences of the recently aggravated problem of forced migration and the influx of refugees constitute a serious challenge to security and stability in Europe. None of the CSCE participating States is able, alone, to cope with streams of refugees fraught with tension and instability. In this respect, it appears that there is a need to develop interaction between, on one hand, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, which undertakes important and indispensable activities in this field, and, on the other hand, the CSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights, which is located in Warsaw.

The delegation of Ukraine joins those States which, from this rostrum, have urged that draft resolution A/48/L.18 be adopted by consensus.

Mr. BATU (Turkey): As a country located at the very epicentre of the area covered by the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) - an area that stretches from Vancouver to Vladivostok - and as a founding Member of the United Nations, Turkey is particularly pleased that we are again considering an item entitled "Cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe".

Since the adoption of the Helsinki Document 1992 and General Assembly resolution 47/10, important steps have been taken to establish effective cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. In this context, Turkey welcomes the exchange on 26 May 1993, between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, of letters concerning a framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE. General Assembly resolution 48/5 of 13 October 1993, which invites the CSCE to participate, as an Observer, in the sessions and work of the Assembly, constitutes another encouraging development in the right direction.

Having taken note of the Secretary-General's valuable report, my delegation wishes to reaffirm its resolute support for his efforts to build on this process of institutionalizing cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE.

Since the end of the cold war it has been our policy to refer to the challenges of the new international order. Despite a sufficiency of creative thinking, however, it has not been possible to establish a clear strategy. We believe that the starting-point for such a strategy should be realization of the fact that action on the challenges we are facing today is beyond the means and resources of a single organization. Thus, we need a collective-security architecture of mutually reinforcing institutions, in which all elements have a role to play. The interaction between global security and regional security requires effective cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and regional organizations. In this connection, Turkey believes that the still-developing institutionalization of cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE sets a precedent.

As the Secretary-General observes in his report, there has been valuable cooperation in some parts of the former Yugoslavia and the former Soviet Union. Turkey attaches great importance to effective coordination between the activities of the United Nations and those of the CSCE in the field of conflict resolution and prevention, particularly in the Balkans and the Caucasus. In this respect, we regard the refusal of Belgrade to extend the mandate of the long-term CSCE missions as a further reason for concern. We share the Secretary-General's view that, until their withdrawal, these missions contributed significantly to the maintenance of stability in Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina. Therefore, we strongly endorse the Security Council's call, in its resolution 855 (1993), for their return at the earliest possible date.

Following the end of the cold war, we embarked on the process of collective and cooperative security. We must admit, however, that quite a few opportunities have been lost along the way. Hence, we believe that the United Nations, under Chapter VIII of its Charter, should continue to develop adequate channels of communication,

coordination and interaction with the regional organizations. We must establish a more rational and cost-effective division of labour between the United Nations and regional organizations, and this must be based on transparency and complementarity.

The enhancement of security and stability in the vast geographical area between Vancouver and Vladivostok is a challenging task. It was in this context that my Minister, in his address to the General Assembly on 30 September this year, made the following call:

> "Turkey lies at the very epicenter of several regions making up the most turbulent part of the Northern hemisphere. We are actively engaged in the post-cold-war search for new approaches to build peace through multilateral action. Our objective is to reinforce the international security system. Only the United Nations can provide legitimacy to regional arrangements and institutions should the latter decide to act in the fields of ... preventive diplomacy, peace-keeping and peace enforcement.
>
> "All three of those categories of action are in demand on Turkey's periphery. My Government deploys all of its available assets to help defuse and resolve these crises. We strive to create and consolidate interlinked areas of solidarity and processes of cooperation." *(Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-eighth Session, Plenary Meetings, 11th meeting, p. 127)*

We pledge our commitment to and our support for the continued efforts to rise above the challenges of our times in the field of global and regional security.

Mr. PASHOVSKI (Bulgaria): I should like, first, to express my satisfaction at the presence of Mr. Wilhelm Höynck, Secretary-General of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE). Mr. Höynck has made a remarkable contribution to the development of the CSCE process, and I have outstanding memories of the work that we have done together.

Over the past year and a half we have witnessed genuine and commendable progress in the cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. The dynamic processes on the European continent and the emergence of real and potential conflicts and points of tension in the CSCE area demonstrate the pressing need for a meaningful response to the challenges in the field of European and global security. The direct link between, on one hand, peace, stability and security in the region and, on the other hand, peace, stability and security in the world at large has prompted the beginning of a process of institutionalizing relations between the United Nations and European organizations - in particular, the CSCE.

Barely a year and a half ago, at the CSCE's Helsinki Summit in 1992, the Heads of State and Government of the participating States declared their understanding that the Conference is a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter, and it is little more than a year since the question of cooperation between the two bodies was formally included in the agenda of the United Nations General Assembly. Over this relatively short period there has been significant positive development of the two bodies' common effort in a number of areas - from conflict prevention and crisis management to human rights issues and economic and environmental problems.

A sound basis for the promotion of the institutional modalities of this process has been laid. Bulgaria welcomes in this regard the conclusion on 26 May 1993 of an agreement between the United Nations Secretary-General and the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE Council on the Framework for cooperation and coordination between the two organizations. By resolution 48/5, of 13 October 1993, the Conference was granted Observer status at the sessions and in the work of the General Assembly. Regular contact and exchange of information and documents have been established and maintained.

This has already yielded noticeable practical results in the field. The United Nations and the CSCE have been coordinating their actions in peacemaking, achieving valuable interaction in such areas of conflict or tension in the CSCE area as Nagorny Karabakh, South Ossetia, Moldova, Tajikistan and Abkhazia, and elsewhere. In the former Yugoslavia a positive framework of coordination has started to evolve, joining the efforts of the United Nations, the European Community and the CSCE, with the indispensable contribution of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Western European Union.

Cooperation has also been enhanced through the introduction of new, more productive forms of coordination in other equally important areas, such as preventive diplomacy and peace-building. We welcome the strengthening of relations between the United Nations and the CSCE in the spheres of human rights and humanitarian issues, including the questions of minorities, economic cooperation and environmental protection.

The positive momentum of this process, achieved over the past period, should be maintained and further developed. The emerging principles of cooperation, taking account of the need for coordination, complementarity,

practical division of labour and pragmatic approaches, should be further strengthened and consistently applied.

The United Nations has formidable experience and resources in a number of spheres pertaining to crisis management, such as peace-keeping, problems related to refugees and humanitarian assistance. The CSCE, for its part, has a valuable record and capabilities in early warning and democratic institution building. Both organizations have established their presence in conflict regions across the CSCE area.

The potential for stepping up practical, mutually reinforcing cooperation of the planning and carrying out of various missions, ranging from fact-finding to peacemaking and to assistance in strengthening democratic institutions, should be built upon in an effort to provide for even greater complementarity and synergy.

A greater integration of representatives from each organization into missions launched by the other is imperative for increased effectiveness. This could prompt a further strengthening of the organizational modalities for such coordination envisaged by the Framework of 26 May 1993. As a first step, a more efficient joint use of logistics and personnel, including joint use at the expert and higher levels, could be outlined and implemented.

The requirements of crisis management in the post-cold-war period, given the complex nature of today's conflicts in the CSCE area, lead us to contemplate opportunities for more global approaches to conflict resolution, involving the United Nations and the CSCE. In this regard, pilot case projects could be launched. They could comprise action programmes for cessation of hostilities, followed by post-conflict peacemaking and peace-building measures, involving disengagement of forces, deployment of military and civilian observers, provision of humanitarian assistance and strengthening of democratic institutions.

New ground for cooperation has been explored in such relatively new spheres for both organizations as assistance in the implementation of preventive and enforcement measures, including the imposition of economic sanctions by the Security Council. Practical cooperation and joint action has been launched in this area through the establishment of the European Community - CSCE Sanctions Assistance Missions in countries neighbouring the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), and close coordination with the Security Council sanctions Committee has been established. This effort should be pursued further, aiming to expand its scope by devising forms of cooperation and mutual support in addressing special economic problems arising from the implementation of these measures.

Great opportunities are being offered by the ongoing reform of the CSCE and its growing capabilities in early warning, conflict prevention, crisis management, security cooperation, peaceful settlement of disputes and planning for peace-keeping operations. It presents new possibilities for enhancing the institutional modalities of cooperation and coordination which should also be examined and utilized.

We welcome the report of the Secretary-General (A/48/549) outlining measures of cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE presented to the Assembly at its current session. In keeping with the need for regular examination and widening of the capabilities for enhanced coordination, we invite him to continue to focus his attention on this issue and to present his views, recommendations and proposals at the next sessions of the Assembly.

In an effort to contribute to enhancing the cooperation and coordination between the two organizations, a group of CSCE participating States, including Bulgaria, have elaborated and put forward a draft resolution for consideration in the current debate. We fully share the comments made by the representative of the CSCE Chairman-in-Office, who introduced the draft on behalf of the co-sponsors, and we hope that it will gain the support of the Assembly.

Mr. CASSAR (Malta): In November 1990 the Heads of State or Government of the States participating in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe assembled in Paris at a time of "profound change and historic expectations" (A/45/859, p. 4) to celebrate the end of an era of confrontation and division in Europe and to adopt the Charter of Paris for a New Europe.

The Charter required a steadfast commitment to democracy, based on human rights and fundamental freedoms, prosperity through economic liberty and social justice, and equal security for all CSCE States.

Europe was then liberating itself from the legacy of the past. The dawning of this time of promise, however, was soon to be clouded by instability and insecurity. When the CSCE Heads of State or Government met in July 1992 at the Helsinki Summit, they acknowledged that economic decline, social tension, aggressive nationalism, intolerance, xenophobia and ethnic conflicts were threatening stability in the CSCE area.

The Helsinki Summit registered yet another reality which had developed since the adoption of the Charter of Paris. In its Summit Declaration it stated:

> "For the first time in decades we are facing warfare in the CSCE region. New armed conflicts and massive use of force to achieve hegemony and territorial expansion continue to occur. The loss of life, human misery, involving huge numbers of refugees have been the worst since the Second World War. Damage to our cultural heritage and the destruction of property have been appalling." *(A/47/361, annex, para. 13)*

The challenge of change has brought with it a need to examine and assess our international efforts to build a new world order. In acknowledging and respecting the distinct contribution of the various international forums and organizations towards building peace in our time, we cannot but continue to explore and consolidate those avenues which foster closer cooperation in preventing and settling conflicts. It is within this context that the cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe must be viewed.

Malta is particularly honoured to have actively contributed to formalizing such cooperation. The idea of having the CSCE declare itself a regional arrangement in terms of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations was explored within this building while the Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Malta, Mr. Guido de Marco, was presiding over the forty-fifth session of the General Assembly, and was later proposed for the consideration of the meeting of the CSCE Council of Ministers in Prague early last year. During the Helsinki Follow-Up Meeting, Malta was foremost among those who proposed and promoted this declaration and submitted the proposal for its adoption.

During this past year, thanks to the commitment of the Foreign Minister of Sweden, who, as Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, devoted great energy to giving this declaration concrete form, we have witnessed agreement on the "Framework for cooperation and coordination between the United Nations Secretariat and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe", signed on 26 May 1993. This cooperation is still in its initial phases, but even at such an early stage it has been put to the test in those zones of conflict which threaten stability in the CSCE region.

The understanding that the CSCE is a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations provides an important link between European and global security.

Experience throughout the past year has shown that results do not necessarily match efforts in conflict prevention and peace-building. That is why a greater effort is required to consolidate cooperation not only in areas which are immediately connected with security, but even in others which may be the root causes of future tensions, including areas of cooperation in the human dimension and economic cooperation.

That is why my delegation continues to regard the discussion of this item as extremely important, and it is in this spirit that my delegation supports the draft resolution on this subject which has been submitted by the representative of Sweden and which, together with other members of the CSCE, we are most happy to co-sponsor.

The President returned to the Chair.

Mr. MALONE (Canada): The draft resolution we are considering today addresses the enhancement of cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), a regional arrangement in the sense of Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter.

On 26 May of this year, the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE exchanged letters signalling their acceptance of a framework for United Nations-CSCE cooperation. This framework provides an excellent basis on which to build mutual cooperation in a variety of areas, particularly in maintaining international peace and security and promoting respect for human rights in the CSCE area.

Indeed, such cooperation is already occurring where it counts most: on the ground. In former Yugoslavia, Georgia, Nagorny Karabakh, Tajikistan and Moldova, the United Nations and the CSCE are cooperating and coordinating in effective ways to build peace and security. In Canada's view, such cooperation and complementarity of activity is absolutely essential to conflict-management efforts.

Within the CSCE, Canada has concentrated on developing the means for effective conflict management by establishing a range of instruments from fact-finding and good offices to mediation and preventive diplomacy. Canada pioneered the idea of CSCE peace-keeping as a necessary element in the spectrum of CSCE conflict-management instruments. We have sought, with other CSCE partners, to strengthen commitments in areas such as minorities, tolerance and democratic development. We

believe our approach to conflict management within the CSCE complements the type of proposals outlined in the "Agenda for Peace".

The relationship the CSCE enjoys with the United Nations is among the most advanced of any regional organization and, I would add, could serve as a useful model for other organizations and regions. Both organizations will benefit from cooperation and coordination in tangible ways.

For the United Nations, strengthening the capacity of regional organizations to promote regional and global security is one of the key objectives outlined in the "Agenda for Peace". A more important role for regional organizations in peace and security will free up time and resources for the United Nations, allowing it to concentrate on those situations where only the United Nations with its global political legitimacy, well-developed infrastructure and resources - can make an impact.

(*spoke in French*)

For the CSCE, closer cooperation and coordination with the United Nations will strengthen the CSCE's own capabilities in areas as diverse as early warning, conflict prevention and crisis management, including fact-finding, preventive diplomacy and peace-keeping. It will also ensure that global political pressure - which only the United Nations can marshal - is brought to bear if and when it is needed in support of CSCE efforts.

Enhanced cooperation and coordination between the United Nations and the CSCE will also make it possible to reduce duplication of effort and to improve effectiveness. This is an era of reduced resources and increased demands on such resources. There must therefore be an effective division of labour between the United Nations and the CSCE when they are active in the same field.

To improve communications, there must be more contacts. The CSCE has invited a representative of the Secretary-General of the United Nations to attend meetings of the CSCE Committee of Senior Officials and of the CSCE Council. Some organs of the United Nations regularly participate in CSCE meetings that deal with their areas of competence. In this respect, we are pleased that the United Nations, in resolution 48/5, has granted the CSCE observer status in the General Assembly.

In order to further the mutual goals of the United Nations and the CSCE in maintaining international peace and security, we fully endorse the draft resolution that we have co-sponsored and that has been presented to the General Assembly by Sweden, in its capacity as Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, on behalf of all the States participating in the CSCE.

Mr. ERDÖS (Hungary) *(interpretation from French)*: Hungary welcomes the consideration of this item on cooperation between the United Nations and the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), as events show that this cooperation is becoming increasingly important. The activities and achievements of the CSCE, which will soon be marking the twentieth anniversary of the Helsinki Final Act - the first basic document of this process - are too well known to Members of the United Nations for me to dwell on them now. However, we wish to highlight two elements to which we attach particular importance.

First, during the cold war, the CSCE was virtually the only general forum for dialogue between East and West and it played a decisive role in the dismantling of the closed societies of Eastern Europe and in launching the process of reconciliation with the ideals of political and economic freedoms. Second, it is fitting to recall that, even at a time when Europe was politically and physically divided and a prey to an unprecedented ideological and military confrontation, the CSCE was able to provide a forum for comprehensive negotiation and cooperation which even today, because of its effectiveness and its infrastructure, can serve as a model to other regions in the world. Although the situation today is fundamentally different, it is important for us to recognize, in retrospect, the historic merits of the Helsinki process.

The CSCE is still a unique organization, including as it does all the countries of North America and Europe and all the former Republics of the former USSR, and thus bringing together, on the basis of its declared principles of the rule of law and democracy, a vast region extending from Vancouver to Vladivostok. The scope of CSCE activities is just as broad as its geographical dimension. They include all the factors involving security in all its dimensions. They range from military security to humanitarian and cultural cooperation. It also involves political principles governing relations between the participating countries, as well as matters concerning economic relations and protection of the environment.

According to the 1992 Helsinki Summit declaration, the CSCE is a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the United Nations Charter. As such, it provides an important link between European security and global security and opens up new horizons for cooperation between the two organizations. The granting of Observer status to the CSCE by the General Assembly in October is certainly a significant step in this direction.

Today, the CSCE faces new challenges. It must seek its new identity by adapting to the changes that have occurred. Hungary highly values the CSCE activities aimed at averting and dealing with conflicts in the region and in promoting and consolidating human rights and the principles of the democratic system. Today's challenges include, in particular, flagrant violations of principles governing inter-State relations between CSCE countries, ethnic conflict, mass violations of human rights, including the rights of minorities, problems relating to nationalisms of all kinds, intolerance and xenophobia. The CSCE continues to deal with these issues and seeks to find the most appropriate ways of coping with these disturbing phenomena. Here we attach particular importance to the establishment 18 months ago of a CSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities. That decision clearly reflects the relationship between the rights of minorities and the maintenance of regional security. It is undeniable that the way these rights are dealt with has a decisive influence not only on stability in the CSCE region but also on international peace and security. Unfortunately, the litany of ethnic tension and conflicts in our region and their impact on the world situation only strengthens the validity of this statement.

Recently, cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE has become a tangible reality in many conflict situations. In the former Yugoslavia, one can mention the long-term missions in Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina - missions which, until the recent refusal to extend their mandate, were a concrete manifestation of the CSCE's preventive diplomacy. Given the continuing crisis in the former Yugoslavia, we think it extremely important that these CSCE missions resume their activities as soon as possible.

We also welcome the assistance given by the countries of the European Union, through the CSCE, to the neighbouring States of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) in implementation of the sanctions imposed on that country by the Security Council. Missions to provide assistance in the implementation of the sanctions represent a significant contribution to enhancing the effectiveness of the sanctions regime.

The situations in Nagorny Karabakh, the Republic of Moldova, Georgia and Tajikistan, provide other examples of cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. Of course, we have to determine the nature of such cooperation depending on the characteristics of the various situations. In so doing, some difficulties in coordination are sometimes inevitable, but they can be easily overcome if there is political will on all sides and if there is a willingness to act together in pursuing the same goals.

We advocate broader cooperation between the two organizations and the enhancement of its cooperation in all areas of common interest. In the practical division of tasks between the United Nations and the CSCE, it is important to avoid duplication and to emphasize the complementarity of their activities. We believe that the problems of cooperation and coordination must be dealt with in a flexible and pragmatic manner - not by using strict and rigid criteria - and on the basis of a specific analysis of a given situation.

Accordingly, we fully support the strengthening of cooperation between these two organizations, and this is reflected in our sponsorship of the draft resolution contained in document A/48/L.18. We are confident that it will be adopted by the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT: In accordance with General Assembly resolution 48/5 of 13 October 1993, I now call on Mr. Wilhelm Höynck, Secretary-General of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Mr. HÖYNCK (Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)): It is a great pleasure and indeed an honour for the Secretary-General of the CSCE to address the General Assembly on the issue of cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE. I greatly appreciate the friendly reception I have been accorded in this august body by the preceding speakers.

The Assembly's discussion today, the granting of Observer status to the CSCE, the formal establishment of a framework for cooperation between the United Nations and the CSCE - all this serves one purpose: to firmly establish and to improve mutually reinforcing cooperation.

As a regional arrangement under Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations, the CSCE wants to make a contribution to the implementation of United Nations policy concepts. They have been outlined in "An Agenda for Peace", prepared by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali. His report stresses that

> "regional arrangements or agencies in many cases possess a potential that should be utilized in serving the functions [of] preventive diplomacy, peace-keeping, peacemaking and post-conflict peace-building." (*A/47/277, para. 64*)

One of the advantages of such regional action is that it can considerably lighten the heavy burden of the United Nations and in particular of the Security Council. This was the intention of the founding fathers and mothers of the United Nations. They laid down in Article 52 of the

Charter that the Members of the United Nations participating in such regional arrangements

> "shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements ... before referring them to the Security Council."

The CSCE was launched more than 20 years ago with the Helsinki Final Act of 1975 as its founding political constitution. But the fundamental changes in the geopolitical environment within the CSCE area at the turn of the last decade also led to a dramatic transformation of the CSCE mission and profile. It became a vehicle for managing this historical change, with new tasks and new activities in the wide CSCE area from Vancouver to Vladivostok.

The new CSCE is based on a comprehensive concept of security. It closely relates the maintenance of peace with respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It links economic and environmental solidarity and cooperation with peaceful inter-State relations. This is the time for exploring all opportunities for new cooperative approaches to strengthening security. Now we must revitalize and consolidate the principle of indivisible security in the CSCE area.

The human dimension - that is, human rights, democracy and the rule of law - is the centre of the CSCE. Norms and commitments in this field have been elevated to unparalleled high levels. They are politically binding, and adherence is monitored in a cooperative system. When human-dimension implementation gives rise to concern, a variety of CSCE mechanisms is available, including fact-finding and rapporteur missions.

At the Moscow Human Dimension Meeting of the CSCE in September 1991 the participating States declared categorically and irrevocably that the commitments undertaken in the field of the human dimension

> "are matters of direct and legitimate concern to all participating States and do not belong exclusively to the internal affairs of the State concerned".

This breakthrough levelled the traditionally almost insurmountable walls of national sovereignty. In the interests of peace and stability, it opened the way for CSCE involvement at an early stage not only in external conflicts, but also in internal conflicts related to human-dimension issues.

Full integration of the human dimension into the broader range of conflict-prevention instruments is one of the priority tasks of the new CSCE. On this basis, the CSCE tries to face the formidable challenges of ongoing wars, ethnic tensions and overall lack of progress towards new stability in the CSCE area. Under the dynamic guidance of the Chairman-in-Office of the CSCE, the Swedish Foreign Minister, Baroness Margarethe af Ugglas, new impulse has been given to CSCE operations, consultations and negotiations.

CSCE operations have extended considerably. Concrete and practical contributions to conflict prevention and, in some cases, crisis management have been made by the growing number of CSCE missions in the field, by the expanding activities of the CSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights and by the CSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities. The overall number of CSCE missions operative this year has been eight. Some were mainly conflict prevention; others in the first place crisis management missions. These small-scale missions are deployed in the Balkans, the Baltic and the Caucasus area. All the missions contributed in varying degrees to stabilizing the respective situations.

It is deeply regrettable - as preceding speakers have already said - that the CSCE missions to Kosovo, Sandjak and Vojvodina in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) could not continue their very useful presence and work in the area because the authorities in Belgrade did not extend the Memorandum of Understanding constituting the working basis of these missions. With the solid backing of the international community it should be possible to achieve a review of this uncooperative decision.

The CSCE is, like the United Nations, faced with the problem that the mandates of its missions continue to have to be extended because further time is needed to achieve satisfactory results. While we realize that, for conflict prevention and crisis management by peaceful means, patience is of the essence, regular and careful review of the situation is undertaken in order to insure that all parties to the conflict continue to be cooperative. It has to be underlined again and again that the conflicting parties cannot expect the missions to solve their problems, but that they themselves have to engage in a quest for settlement.

Since the beginning of 1992 the CSCE has been increasingly involved in the conflict in and around Nagorny Karabakh. With the repeated explicit support of the United Nations Security Council, the so-called Minsk Group countries of the CSCE have tried to move with the conflicting parties towards a solid framework for negotiating a solution. This framework must include a holding cease-fire that might be observed by about 500 CSCE monitors.

It is the common understanding of all CSCE participating States, laid down in the decisions of the Helsinki Summit 1992, that CSCE peace-keeping operations will not entail enforcement action. This is one of the compelling reasons for close cooperation and coordination between the CSCE and the United Nations, because the continuity of crisis management must be ensured if the application of peaceful means proves to be ineffective.

As all crisis settlement efforts are becoming increasingly difficult while the civilian population is exposed to unbearable suffering, the CSCE tries to improve its potential for conflict prevention. The first CSCE High Commissioner on National Minorities, Mr. Max van der Stoel of the Netherlands, took office in January 1993. He has the task of providing early warning and, as appropriate, early action at the earliest possible stage in regard to tensions involving national minority issues. In this framework, the High Commissioner has become active in a great number of States, particularly in the Baltic and in the Balkans. The very positive response to his intensive activity in his first year of office showed that flexible, discreet and authoritative advice based on broad international support is one of the promising answers to our new challenges.

During the past year CSCE consultations have also achieved a new dimension. These consultations on all issues pertinent to the CSCE have centred around the conflicts with which the CSCE is seized. In addition, and as an important element of the development of a cooperative security structure, participating States can raise and are raising particular political and security concerns.

CSCE negotiations focused on measures of disarmament and confidence- and security-building. In the CSCE area the old threats of all-out military confrontation are gone. But large military potentials remain, while the area is facing new challenges. Furthermore, there is a risk of fragmentation of European security. The immediate concern is localized, typically small-scale resort to force. The CSCE is developing new arrangements the better to respond to these challenges and to counter the abuse of force externally and internally. Decisions on transparency of defence planning, stabilizing measures for localized crisis situations and principles of arms transfers and military contacts are now under preparation. The new code of conduct governing relations between States with regard to security-related matters is being negotiated. That would be a landmark contribution to cooperative security approaches.

This selection of CSCE activities underlines the complementarity of CSCE and United Nations action. The CSCE has a deep and sincere interest in mutually reinforcing cooperation with the United Nations as well as with other regional organizations. Each should preserve its own area of action and responsibility. We have to look for a constructive division of labour on the basis of comparative advantages. Since our means will hardly suffice to meet all challenges, we cannot permit duplication of efforts.

The many positive comments and the substantial proposals made here today are really encouraging. I appreciate the prospect of the adoption of draft resolution A/48/L.18, with its impressive list of sponsors. We all know that there is still room for deepening coordination and cooperation between the CSCE and the United Nations. I am fully confident that we will make progress. This will increase the potential available for solving the challenges that we are facing. There is no other choice. Only a multi-institutional structure can maintain the will and provide the means necessary to reach our common aim - a lasting and peaceful order in the CSCE area.

The PRESIDENT: Before taking action on the draft resolution, I should like to announce that the following countries have become sponsors of draft resolution A/48/L.18: Belarus, the Czech Republic, Georgia, Iceland, Luxembourg, Poland and The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.

The Assembly will now take a decision on draft resolution A/48/L.18.

May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/48/L.18 was adopted (resolution 48/19).

The PRESIDENT: May I also take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 26?

It was so decided.

AGENDA ITEM 151 (continued)

UNITED NATIONS INITIATIVE ON OPPORTUNITY AND PARTICIPATION: DRAFT RESOLUTION (A/48/L.19)

Mr. KOROMA (Sierra Leone): The Sierra Leone delegation attaches importance to the timely initiative on opportunity and participation formulated and proposed by the Government of the Independent State of Papua New Guinea.

These concepts of opportunity and participation are not only eternal verities but remain essential prerequisites for the socio-economic development of the developing countries. The importance of the proposal further lies in the fact that both concepts are for the first time being addressed together in this forum to highlight the imbalances that characterize particularly the economic activities in many of our developing countries, where the vast majority are given or offered a dismal fraction of the requisite opportunities to enable them to participate effectively in the socio-economic development of their respective countries.

Indeed, mineral as well as other natural resources in our countries have to be mined or exploited to provide much-needed revenue and foreign exchange for the use of Governments, but a cause for regret is the continuing dearth of adequate educational and other meaningful opportunities and facilities to enable the indigenous people to acquire not only the opportunity but also the experience needed to hold meaningful positions that will enable them to participate effectively in the overall economic development of their respective countries. In short, there is an urgent need for an increase in the opportunities that are open to nationals of our countries to serve as floodgates for meaningful participation in the ongoing and future economic-development projects and ventures in many of our countries.

The Sierra Leone delegation also welcomes the decision of the Government of Papua New Guinea to submit what we consider to be a well-thought-out proposal to have an ad hoc panel of distinguished experts and experienced persons broadly representative of the international community appointed as the "United Nations Panel on Opportunity and Participation" to conduct a comprehensive, systematic and thorough study of opportunity and participation, with particular reference to the economies of the developing countries, with the objective of finding practical options for increasing and maximizing opportunity and participation in the economies of developing countries. It is expected that that panel will review relevant areas of public policy, the legal system, administration, economics, finance and banking, and will assess the contributions which Governments, the private sectors and non-governmental organizations can make in linking opportunity to participation.

The appropriate nature and timeliness of the Papua New Guinea initiative for most developing countries cannot be overemphasized. The unhealthy nature of the economies of many developing countries, the reduction of flows of official development assistance and the increasing competition for foreign aid, investments and loans are additional reasons to undertake a study that will focus attention on and identify the underlying causes of the poor performance of the economies and other development aspects of many developing countries and to emerge with recommendations - including hard work, of course - as to how to overcome our poor economic performance and underdevelopment.

Secondly, there is the time-frame within which the panel should commence and complete its work and its mandate. Unlike other proposals before the United Nations that do not have any stated dates for the beginning and completion of their implementation, the proposal under consideration specifies January 1994 as the date on which the panel should commence its work, and the report should be submitted for consideration by the time of the fiftieth session of the General Assembly, in 1995. In addition, in the draft resolution the Secretary-General is requested to submit a progress report on the work of the panel to the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session next year. This, we believe, underlines the urgency of the situation and what is expected of the panel that will be so constituted.

The Sierra Leone delegation is persuaded that this initiative will not further burden the resources of the Organization in as much as resources for its implementation will be sought from voluntary contributions from Member States and other international organizations. This initiative should not only complement the proposed new agenda for development which is under preparation by the Secretary-General but should catalyses the implementation of the United Nations New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s and the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the 1990s and should act as a further commitment to the full implementation of Agenda 21. The recommendations presented by the panel, which it is proposed to establish, should also include a definition and elaboration of what opportunities for participation should entail in the context of the forthcoming United Nations World Summit for Social Development and the Global Conference on the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States.

Finally, the proposal deserves the support of every delegation at the United Nations because it is, above all, people-oriented. It underscores the mobilization of people and resources, on the basis of an awareness of the actual circumstances in which people, particularly rural villagers, women and other disadvantaged groups, spend their lives. My delegation therefore fully supports the proposal and commends the draft resolution for adoption.

Mrs. JAGAN (Guyana): In this post-cold-war era the United Nations is both challenged and stimulated by the opportunities afforded it to transform the adverse conditions under which so many of the world's inhabitants labour.

The challenges range from the more recent preoccupation with peace-keeping, peacemaking and preventive diplomacy, to the traditional tasks of facilitating and promoting social and economic development and the safeguarding of both sovereign and individual rights, including the right to development and the equitable participation of all in the benefits of that process.

The opportunities are similarly multifaceted. The prevailing environment in which the world is no longer constrained by the forces of ideological polarity presents us with an unprecedented opportunity to effect ready solutions to the very challenges which confront us as a world community. It is a chance to extend ourselves, to allow for a greater involvement by all nations in a concerted attempt to remedy the problems of the world.

The item on which the Assembly is now focused speaks of a United Nations initiative on opportunity and participation. The main theme of this subject is the issue of development. This item brings a new perspective to the development debate at a time when a fresh viewpoint is badly needed. After all these years, is it not time to focus on practical ways of enhancing international cooperation so that attention can truly focus on the means of implementation? Developing countries are not helped by declarations which restate old platitudes without a concurrent commitment of political will and resources. It is a sad, but I fear accurate, statement that our countries are further away from the goal of attaining a better life for their peoples than they were when we first began this dialogue in the international arena some 30 years ago.

It is indicative of the measure of importance that the membership of the Organization attaches to the issue of development, and to the role of the United Nations in achieving it, that we at this particular juncture are dealing with so many aspects pertinent to its global attainment. Many representatives speaking at the current session, as well as at the last session, have called for the launching of an agenda for development, on which we eagerly await the report of the Secretary-General.

It is not by coincidence that both the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Group of 77 have endorsed an initiative for the reactivation of the North-South dialogue. Meanwhile we continue to deliberate on the implementation of Agenda 21 and the sustainable development of small island and low-lying coastal States; on the situation concerning least developed and land-locked countries; and on the New Agenda for the Development of Africa in the 1990s, to cite but a few of our developmental preoccupations in this body.

Whether one speaks of opportunity and participation in the economic and social process at the national level, in the context of activities of the United Nations, or in relation to the role and activities of the private sector, a common thread is the development goal that is the object of consideration.

The attainment of the goal of economic and social development is of paramount importance for our countries. Such development must be balanced and sustainable. It must take account of our physical and cultural heritage and diversity. It must also take account of the requirement for bequeathing this heritage to future generations. It must ensure the rational development of all our resources, both human and material.

The developmental process in which we are engaged must be equitable. It must meet the needs and requirements of every group in our society at the national level, and of countries large and small at the global level. The equitable distribution of resources and the opportunity for all to share in their benefits are critical elements in the development challenge with which we are faced.

The Guyana delegation is of the view that we must therefore respond to this challenge in a rational way. The time has come for us to bring together the various approaches to a possible solution in a single, common agenda. The opportunity for concerted action to address the development imperative rests with this session of the General Assembly. We wish to commend the Government of Papua New Guinea for this laudable initiative and we invite the Assembly to collaborate in charting the way forward.

The meeting rose at 1 p.m.